

REMARKS

The above preliminary amendments and following remarks are submitted in accordance with a Request for Continued Examination filed on even date and in response to the Final Official Action of the Examiner mailed on January 26, 2005. Having addressed all objections and grounds of rejection, claims 1-20, being all the pending claims, are now deemed in condition for allowance. Entry of this amendment and reconsideration to that end is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,169,992, issued to Beall (hereinafter referred to as "Beall"). This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed as to the amended claims for the reasons provided below.

The Examiner and Applicants have had adequate opportunity to present arguments concerning their views of the key elements of Applicants' invention and the disclosure of Beall. Therefore, Applicants' will not herein repeat positions which have been previously argued at length. Instead, Applicants will focus on the effect of the above amendments, which make more explicit the distinctions which have already been argued.

Claim 1 has been amended to add a "save component module". This structure and its functionality are intrinsic in Applicants' invention in that the claimed "service" built in accordance with

the invention is not transitory, as are the queries of Beall. See Fig. 25 and accompanying discussion in the specification, for example. The "service" built by Applicants' invention is saved for future use and is further available for "editing" as has already been claimed to produce yet additional unique "services". As previously explained, there is no showing that Beall has any "service" as claimed. Furthermore, there can be no suggest of apparatus and methods of saving such a "service" for future use.

These conclusions are directly supported by Beall, column 43, lines 48-56, and column 50, lines 9-16, which have been confusingly cited by the Examiner. Applicants build a "service" which Beall does not. As amended, claim 1 requires structure for saving the "service" which Beall does not. Therefore, the rejection of claim 1, and all claims depending therefrom, is respectfully traversed.

Claim 6 has been similarly amended to require "a service storage module located within said data base management system which stores said service request within said data base for future use". As explained above, Beall does not have this structure. Therefore, the rejection of claim 6, and all claims depending therefrom is respectfully traversed.

Claim 11 is an independent method claim. To the original three steps, a fourth step has been added. It requires "storing said service within said data base for future use". This process

step is simply not found within Beall. Therefore, the rejection of claim 11, and all claims depending therefrom, is respectfully traversed.

Claim 16 is an independent apparatus claim having "means-plus-function" limitations. To the previous three elements, the above amendment adds the further limitation of a "storing means". This element is not found in Beall. Therefore, the rejection of claim 16, and all claims depending therefrom, is respectfully traversed.

Claims 2, 7, and 18 depend from claims 1, 6, and 17, respectively, and further limit the "publicly accessible digital data communication network". Beall does not meet the limitations of claims 1, 6, and 17 from which claims 2, 7, and 18 depend. Therefore, Beall cannot meet the further limitations of these dependent claims. Thus, the rejection of claims 2, 7, and 18 is respectfully traversed.

Claims 3, 9, 13-14, and 20 depend from claims 2, 8, 12, and 19 respectively, and further limit the "user terminal". Beall does not meet the limitations of claims 2, 8, 12, and 19 from which claims 3, 9, 13-14, and 20 depend. Therefore, Beall cannot meet the further limitations of these dependent claims. Thus, the rejection of claims 3, 9, 13-14, and 20 is respectfully traversed.

Claims 4, 8, and 17 depend from claims 3, 7, and 16, respectively, and further limit the "data wizard". Beall does not meet the limitations of claims 3, 7, and 16 from which claims 4, 8, and 17 depend. Therefore, Beall cannot meet the further limitations of these dependent claims. Thus, the rejection of claims 2, 7, and 17 is respectfully traversed.

Claims 5, 10, 15, and 19 depend from claims 4, 9, 14, and 18 respectively, and further limit the "data base management system". Beall does not meet the limitations of claims 4, 9, 14, and 18 from which claims 5, 10, 15, and 19 depend. Therefore, Beall cannot meet the further limitations of these dependent claims. Thus, the rejection of claims 5, 10, 15, and 19 is respectfully traversed.

Claim 12 depends from claim 11 and is further limited by the "editing" step. Beall does not meet the limitations of claim 11 from which claim 12 depends. Therefore, Beall cannot meet the further limitations of this dependent claim. Thus, the rejection of claim 12 is respectfully traversed.

Having thus responded to each objection and ground of rejection, Applicants respectfully request entry of this amendment and allowance of claims 1-20, being the only pending claims.

Please charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment to
Deposit Account No. 14-0620.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas N. Turba et al.

By their attorney,



Date May 26, 2005

Wayne A. Sivertson
Reg. No. 25,645
Suite 401

Broadway Place East
3433 Broadway Street N.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota
55413
(612) 331-1464